The Original

MULTI-RATER FEEDBACK AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR BANKS IN INDIA

Pratyush Gautam[1*], Reshma R. Nair[2]

[1*]Research Scholar, Amity Business School, Amity University, Mumbai. Email ID: pratyush.sbi@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, Amity Business School, Amity University, Mumbai

ABSTRACT
Employee engagement has emerged as a critical determinant of organizational success, particularly in service industries such as banking. Multi-rater feedback systems, commonly known as 360-degree feedback, are increasingly recognized as tools that enhance engagement by promoting fairness, transparency, and developmental focus in performance appraisal. This article presents a literature review on the relationship between multi-rater feedback and employee engagement, with a comparative analysis with regard to the public and private sector banks in India. Findings suggest that private banks demonstrate greater openness to innovation and developmental feedback, leading to higher engagement, while public banks face challenges rooted in bureaucracy and hierarchical culture. The article proposes a sector-specific framework and identifies research gaps for future exploration.

KEYWORDS: Multi-rater feedback, employee engagement, performance appraisal, public sector banks, private sector banks, India

INTRODUCTION

Employee engagement is widely acknowledged as a driver of productivity, innovation, and customer satisfaction. In banking, where service quality and trust are paramount, employee engagement directly influences organizational performance. Performance appraisal systems play a crucial role in shaping engagement by demonstrating fairness, recognition, and developmental opportunities.

Public sector banks (PSBs) in India have traditionally relied on annual confidential reports (ACRs), which emphasize tenure and compliance but are often criticized for lack of transparency and developmental focus (Khandelwal, 2007). In contrast, private sector banks (PrSBs) have adopted modern appraisal practices, including multi-rater feedback, competency-based evaluations, and customer-linked performance metrics (Malavia, M. G. 2016).

This article reviews literature on multi-rater feedback and employee engagement, comparing PSBs and PrSBs. It aims to provide a conceptual foundation for understanding sectoral differences and to propose frameworks for enhancing appraisal effectiveness in Indian banking.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Global Evolution of Multi-Rater Feedback

Multi-rater feedback, often referred to as 360-degree feedback, emerged prominently in the 1980s as organizations sought more holistic approaches to evaluating leadership effectiveness. Early adopters in Western corporations recognized that traditional top-down appraisal systems were limited in scope, often reflecting only the supervisor's perspective. However, multi-rater feedback incorporates evaluations from peers, subordinates, and sometimes customers or other stakeholders, offering a more comprehensive view of employee performance (London & Smither, 1995).

London and Smither (1995) demonstrated that multi-rater feedback could reshape self-perceptions, enhance self-awareness, and improve performance outcomes. Their work highlighted how feedback from multiple sources reduced bias and provided employees with actionable insights for development. This marked a significant departure from conventional appraisal systems, which were often criticized for subjectivity and lack of developmental focus.

Bracken, Timmreck, and Church (2001) consolidated global practices by documenting the widespread adoption of multi-rater feedback across industries. They emphasized its role not only in performance evaluation but also in organizational learning, leadership development, and succession planning.

Atwater and Waldman (1998) further advanced the discourse by linking multi-rater feedback to leadership development, arguing that feedback from diverse sources provided leaders with a more accurate understanding of their strengths and weaknesses. Smither, London, and Reilly (2005) also noted that the system became a cornerstone of performance management practices, particularly in organizations emphasizing continuous learning and employee development.

The global evolution of multi-rater feedback thus reflects a shift from appraisal as a compliance mechanism to appraisal as a developmental tool. Its widespread adoption underscores the growing recognition that employee performance and engagement are best understood through multiple perspectives, aligning with broader trends in organizational justice and participatory management (Colquitt, 2001; Fletcher, 2001).

2.2 Employee Engagement Theories

Employee engagement is based in the theories of motivation and organizational behaviour, and has evolved into a central construct in management research. Kahn (1990) provided the foundational definition of engagement as the harnessing of employees' selves to their work roles, whereby individuals express themselves (physically, cognitively and emotionally) during role performance. His work emphasized the psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability as critical antecedents of engagement.

Building on this foundation, Saks (2006) linked engagement to social exchange theory, arguing that when employees perceive organizational support, fairness, and recognition, they reciprocate with higher levels of engagement. This perspective highlights the reciprocal nature of the employer–employee relationship, where engagement is not simply a function of individual motivation but is shaped by organizational practices and perceived fairness.

Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) advanced the construct by introducing the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model, which conceptualizes engagement as a positive, fulfilling work-related state characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption. According to this model, engagement is fostered when job resources (e.g., autonomy, feedback, social support) balance job demands (e.g., workload, emotional strain). Multi-rater feedback systems align with this framework by providing employees with constructive feedback, recognition, and developmental opportunities, thereby enhancing job resources.

Further research has emphasized the role of organizational justice in engagement. Colquitt (2001) demonstrated that perceptions of fairness — procedural, distributive, and interactional — significantly influence employee attitudes and behaviours, including engagement. When appraisal systems are perceived as fair and transparent, employees are more likely to invest themselves in their work roles. Similarly, May, Gilson, and Harter (2004) found that psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability strongly predict engagement, reinforcing Kahn's (1990) original framework.

Thus, engagement theories converge on the idea that fairness, recognition, and developmental opportunities are critical antecedents. Multi-rater feedback systems, by incorporating diverse perspectives and emphasizing developmental feedback, directly address these antecedents, making them powerful tools for fostering engagement in organizations.

2.3 Linking Feedback and Engagement

Multi-rater feedback enhances engagement by promoting fairness (procedural justice), transparency (interactional justice), and developmental focus. Studies show that employees who perceive appraisal systems as fair and constructive are more engaged, motivated, and committed (Colquitt, 2001; Jawahar, 2007).

3. Multi-Rater Feedback in Indian Banking

3.1 Public Sector Banks

PSBs traditionally relied on ACRs, emphasizing compliance and tenure. These systems often fail to capture competencies required in modern banking (Rao, 2004). Attempts to introduce competency-based appraisals faced resistance due to hierarchical culture and unionized environments (Khandelwal, 2007). Engagement levels are often lower due to perceptions regarding their bias and lack of developmental focus.

3.2 Private Sector Banks

PrSBs such as ICICI, HDFC, and Axis Bank embraced global HR practices, integrating multi-rater feedback into leadership development and customer service appraisal. Employees reported higher satisfaction and engagement due to perceived fairness and developmental focus (Singh, Sharma & Cheema, 2011). Case evidence shows that private banks leverage customer feedback to align employee performance with service quality (HDFC Bank, 2015).

4. Comparative Analysis

4.1 Structural Differences

PSBs emphasize stability and compliance, with promotions often tenure-based along with suitability test through written examination or personal interview. On the other hand, PrSBs emphasize agility, innovation, and meritocracy (Malavia, M. G. 2016). Structural rigidity in PSBs limits engagement, while PrSBs' performance-linked systems foster motivation.

4.2 Cultural Differences

PSBs often exhibit hierarchical organizational cultures in which authority and status can discourage employees from providing candid feedback. Employees may perceive feedback as punitive or fear negative consequences for expressing concerns. In contrast, PrSBs generally promote more open and participative communication, allowing employees to view feedback as an opportunity for professional growth and organizational improvement. Such cultural differences can significantly influence employee willingness to share constructive feedback and managers' ability to respond effectively (Schein & Schein, 2017)

4.3 Technological Integration

PrSBs increasingly invest in advanced HR technologies that integrate employee appraisal systems with workforce analytics and customer feedback, improving transparency and decision-making. In contrast, PSBs may face challenges due to legacy systems, which can limit efficiency, accessibility, and transparency in performance management. Technology can also enhance employee engagement by enabling timely, continuous, and constructive feedback. Effective digital integration therefore supports more responsive performance management and strengthens communication between employees and managers (Cascio & Montealegre, 2016).

5. Case Evidence

State Bank of India (SBI): SBI represents the broader challenges faced by public-sector banks in reforming traditional performance-management practices. Khandelwal argued that conventional appraisal systems in PSBs often failed to differentiate effectively between high and low performers and did not create an organization-wide performance culture. He emphasized the need for more objective performance measures linked to organizational objectives and employee competencies. Such reforms can encounter resistance where employees and managers are accustomed to hierarchical practices, making effective training, communication, and cultural change essential (Khandelwal, 2007)

ICICI Bank: ICICI Bank adopted a structured leadership-development approach in which 360-degree feedback was used to assess leadership potential and support employee development. The process incorporated feedback against defined leadership competencies, allowing the bank to identify employees with the potential to assume future leadership responsibilities. This approach linked performance assessment with succession planning, learning and development, and broader organizational objectives. Evidence from ICICI Bank's leadership-development practices indicates that 360-degree feedback was used as an input for assessing leadership potential while also helping employees understand their developmental needs. Thus, the system moved performance appraisal beyond a purely supervisory assessment toward a broader, developmental approach (Aon Hewitt, 2015)

HDFC Bank: HDFC Bank provides evidence of a customer-oriented approach to performance and employee development. During 2014–15, the bank monitored customer complaints and identified major service-related problem areas for root-cause remediation. At the same time, it invested in employee learning and development, providing an average of 36 hours of training per employee, alongside initiatives designed to keep employees informed, engaged, and empowered. This combination suggests that customer experience information was used to identify service-improvement priorities while employee development supported better service delivery. Therefore, HDFC Bank illustrates how customer feedback and employee engagement can contribute to continuous improvement in banking services (HDFC Bank, 2015).

6. Synthesis and Interpretation of findings

The literature indicates that private-sector banks (PrSBs) generally have greater organizational readiness for multi-rater feedback because of their emphasis on employee development, leadership accountability, customer orientation, and innovative HR practices. In contrast, public-sector banks (PSBs) may experience greater difficulty in implementing such systems because of hierarchical structures, established work practices, employee resistance to change, and comparatively slower technological transformation. Evidence from Indian banking research shows that performance appraisal is important for both employee and organizational outcomes, while comparative research has specifically examined differences in appraisal practices between public- and private-sector banks (Singh, Sharma & Cheema, 2011; Malavia, 2016).

The findings further suggest that cultural transformation is particularly important for PSBs. Employees need to perceive feedback as developmental rather than punitive, while confidentiality and procedural fairness can increase trust in multi-rater systems. The evidence suggests that the success of multi-rater feedback depends not only on the appraisal mechanism itself but also on organizational culture, leadership support, employee trust, training, and technological capability.

7. Suggested Sector-Specific Framework

Drawing from the analysis of existing literature, a tailored framework is suggested to enhance the implementation and overall effectiveness of multi-rater feedback systems within the banking industry. This framework acknowledges that variations in organizational culture, leadership styles, technological capabilities, and employee expectations impact the efficacy of performance appraisal systems in both public-sector banks (PSBs) and private-sector banks (PrSBs).

To begin with, leadership commitment is highlighted as a crucial component of the framework. Executives at the highest levels should proactively show their support for multi-rater feedback and create an atmosphere built on trust, fairness, confidentiality, and accountability. Demonstrating visible commitment from leadership can alleviate employee concerns and bolster the acceptance of feedback systems.

Second, cultural sensitization is essential for encouraging employees to provide and receive candid feedback. Training and awareness programmes should emphasize that feedback is developmental rather than punitive. Particular attention is required in PSBs, where hierarchical structures and established work practices may inhibit open communication.

Third, technology integration should support the systematic collection, analysis, and dissemination of multi-rater feedback. Digital appraisal platforms can improve transparency, efficiency, accessibility, and timely feedback while enabling organizations to integrate employee, peer, supervisor, subordinate, and customer perspectives.

Fourth, a hybrid appraisal model is proposed that combines conventional performance indicators with multi-rater inputs. Quantitative measures such as productivity, targets, and service outcomes can be complemented by qualitative assessments of leadership, teamwork, communication, customer orientation, and behavioural competencies. Such integration can provide a more comprehensive assessment of employee performance.

Finally, an employee-engagement orientation should connect feedback outcomes with recognition, learning and development, career progression, and succession planning. When employees perceive a clear relationship between feedback and career opportunities, they are more likely to regard the appraisal process as meaningful and developmental.

Overall, the proposed framework suggests that effective multi-rater feedback requires more than the adoption of an appraisal tool. Its success depends on the interaction of leadership commitment, cultural readiness, technological capability, integrated appraisal practices, and employee development. The framework, therefore, provides a sector-sensitive approach that can guide PSBs and PrSBs in designing appraisal systems suited to their respective organizational contexts.

8. Research Gaps

(i) Limited Comparative Studies:
There is limited empirical research directly comparing PSBs and PrSBs in the implementation and effectiveness of multi-rater feedback. More comparative studies are needed to examine differences in culture, leadership commitment, technology adoption, and employee acceptance.

(ii) Lack of Longitudinal Research:
Existing studies are largely cross-sectional and provide limited evidence on the long-term effects of multi-rater feedback. Longitudinal research is needed to assess its sustained impact on employee engagement, motivation, performance, and career development.

(iii) Need for Sector-Specific Frameworks:
There is a need to develop frameworks specifically suited to the Indian banking sector, considering differences in organizational hierarchy, regulatory requirements, technological capabilities, and workplace culture between PSBs and PrSBs.

(iv) Fairness, Confidentiality, and Trust:
Limited research has examined how perceived fairness, confidentiality, and trust influence employee acceptance of multi-rater feedback. These factors may act as important mediators between feedback practices and employee engagement.

(v) Limited Evidence on Technology-Enabled Feedback:
Further research is required to examine how digital HR platforms, analytics, and automated feedback systems influence the effectiveness, transparency, and employee experience of multi-rater appraisal systems.

9. CONCLUSION

Overall Significance:
This literature review highlights the growing importance of multi-rater feedback systems as a strategic performance-management mechanism for enhancing employee engagement in the Indian banking sector. By incorporating feedback from supervisors, peers, subordinates, and, where appropriate, customers, multi-rater systems can provide a more comprehensive assessment of employee performance and development needs.

Differences Between PrSBs and PSBs:
The review indicates that private-sector banks (PrSBs) generally demonstrate greater readiness and effectiveness in adopting multi-rater feedback because of their emphasis on innovation, employee development, leadership accountability, and technology-enabled HR practices. In contrast, public-sector banks (PSBs) may face structural and cultural barriers, including hierarchical decision-making, resistance to change, established work practices, and limitations associated with legacy systems.

Role of Organizational Culture:
The effectiveness of multi-rater feedback depends not only on the appraisal mechanism but also on the organizational environment in which it operates. Building trust, confidentiality, transparency, and openness to feedback is particularly important for encouraging employees to participate actively and view feedback as a developmental opportunity rather than a punitive exercise.

Implications for Employee Engagement:
When feedback is linked with recognition, training, career development, and performance improvement, employees are more likely to perceive the appraisal process as meaningful. Consequently, multi-rater feedback can contribute to greater employee involvement, motivation, commitment, and alignment with organizational objectives.

Final Perspective:
Overall, multi-rater feedback represents a promising approach for strengthening performance management and employee engagement in Indian banking. However, its success depends on the alignment of leadership commitment, organizational culture, technological capability, employee trust, and developmental practices. A context-sensitive approach can therefore help both PSBs and PrSBs realize the full potential of multi-rater feedback in a rapidly changing banking environment.

REFERENCES

1. Atwater, L. E., & Waldman, D. A. (1998). 360-degree feedback and leadership development. Human Resource Management, 37(2), 125-139.
2. Bracken, D. W., Timmreck, C. W., & Church, A. H. (2001). The handbook of multisource feedback. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
3. Cascio, W. F., & Montealegre, R. (2016). How technology is changing work and organizations. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 3, 349–375.
4. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(3), 386-400.

5. Fletcher, C. (2001). Performance appraisal and management: The developing research agenda. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74(4), 473-487.
6. Malavia, M. G. (2016). A comparative analysis of performance appraisal in selected public sector banks and private sector banks in India (Doctoral thesis, Saurashtra University)
7. Singh, S., Sharma, G. D., & Cheema, H. D. (2011). A study of effect of performance appraisal on the organization and the employee. SSRN.
8. Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). Organizational culture and leadership (5th ed.). Wiley.
9. HDFC Bank. (2015). Customer feedback integration in performance appraisal. Mumbai: HDFC HR White Paper.
10. ICICI Bank. (2012). Leadership development through 360-degree feedback. Mumbai: ICICI HR Report.
11. Aon Hewitt. (2015). Leadership assessment—The backbone of a strong leadership pipeline. Aon Hewitt.
12. Jawahar, I. M. (2007). The influence of fairness perceptions on performance appraisal reactions. Journal of Labor Research, 28(4), 735-754.
13. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33(4), 692-724.
14. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(7), 600–619.
15. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25(3), 293–315.
16. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77(1), 11–37.
17. Khandelwal, A. (2007). HR challenges in public sector banks. Economic and Political Weekly, 42(11), 975-982.
18. London, M., & Smither, J. W. (1995). Can multi-source feedback change perceptions of goal accomplishment, self-evaluations, and performance-related outcomes? Personnel Psychology, 48(4), 803-839.
19. Smither, J. W., London, M., & Reilly, R. R. (2005). Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.